

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS,

	THE U	Washi	ngton, D.C. 20231
SERIAL NUMBER FIL	ING DATE F	RST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO
07/950,380 0	9/22/92 WILSON		W 2026-4034 EXAMINEN
	128	2/0607	GOLDBERG, J
WILLIAM S. FEI		270007	
MORGAN & FINNE 345 PARK AVENU			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NEW	YORK 10154		1205
This is a communication from the exam	iner in charge of your application		06/07/93
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND	HALIEMARKS		
☐ This application has been exam	ned Responsive to	communication filed on _!/	2/ F7/s action is made final.
A shortened statutory period for res			
Fallure to respond within the period	for response will cause the app	ication to become abandone	d. 35 U.S.C. 133
Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTA	CHMENT(8) ARE PART OF TH	8 ACTION:	
1. Dyetice of References Cit			Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Ap 5. Information on How to E	pplicant, PTO-1449. Ifect Drawing Changes, PTO-14		nformal Patent Application, Form PTO-152.
Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION			
1. Claims 7			are pending in the application
Of the above, clair	ns		are withdrawn from consideration.
2. Claims			have been cancelled.
3. Claims		`	are allowed.
4. (2) Claims 1-4			are rejected.
5. Claims			are objected to.
6. Cleims		ar	e subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. This application has bee	n filed with informal drawings u	nder 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are	acceptable for examination purposes.
8. Formal drawings are req	ulred in response to this Office	action.	
9. The corrected or substite are acceptable.	ute drawings have been receive not acceptable (see explanatio	d onn n or Notice re Patent Drawin	Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings g, PTO-948).
10. The proposed additional examiner. disappro	or substitute sheet(s) of drawin wed by the examiner (see explan		has (have) been approved by the
11. The proposed drawing of	The proposed drawing correction, filed on, has been _ approved disapproved (see explanation).		
			by has Deen received not been received
been filed in parent	application, serial no	; filed on	MANAGEMENT OF THE STATE OF THE
	Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.		
14. Other			



Serial No. 07/950,380

Art Unit 1205

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the Rowinsky et al. reference of record for the reasons fully set forth in Paper No. 2, page 2. Applicants' remarks are noted but the claims are drawn to employing 35 mg of toxal per m^2 for 24. Applicants are using the above for 96 hours, therefore 35 X 3 is 105 mg/m 2 96 hours. A showing is need to compound 200 mg/m $_2$ /24 hours vs. 105 mg/m $_2$ /96 hours.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph,



Serial No. 07/950,380

Art Unit 1205

as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "in excess of 24 hours" in claim 1 is indefinite in failing to recite an upper limit. Correction is required.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Goldberg: ach May 27, 1993 PEROME D. GOLDBERG EXAMINER

CROUP AST UNIT 125